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Summary:

This report is the last of three reports that will support the review of the enforcement policy. This report will focus on controlled parking zones outlining the following points:

- Are the current vouchers, permits, dispensations etc. effective and cost-effective to administer?
- To take an in-depth look at the borough's permits, reviewing their basis, criteria and effectiveness
- To examine some best practice examples from other boroughs
- What are the alternatives to CPZ's

Recommendation(s)

To allow the Committee to review the basis for CPZ Consolidation.
1. **Background & Introduction**

Why did the Safer and Strong Community Select Committee (SSCSC) choose to undertake an in-depth review of the consolidation of Controlled Parking Zones (CPZ)

1.1 In July 2015, the SSCSC was presented with a scoping paper asking for them to accept a series of reports linking into the parking strategy.
- July 2015 Footway Parking
- September 2015 New parking opportunities
- October 2015 Consolidation of controlled parking zones

1.2 The SSCSC chose to undertake its in-depth review of these three areas to support the fairness, transparency and consistency of new schemes being designed and implemented.

1.3 **Parking Zones (PZs)**

A Parking Zone (or PZ in generic terms) is an area where all kerbside space is controlled by either yellow lines or parking places which generally have the same operational hours and days of control. There are three types of zone currently used in Barking & Dagenham:

- A controlled parking zone (CPZ) where zone entry plates indicate the operational hours of the single yellow lines within the zone. Any single yellow lines within parking zones are accompanied by signs, but the zones do not have entry plates.

- The second type is a restricted zone or RZ which applies to the following locations: Anne Mews (AM) and Lancaster Avenue.

- Individual Streets with Pay & Display/Pay by Phone bays.

Parking zones have been designed and implemented to assist areas suffering from 'parking stress', where demand for parking is close to or exceeds the supply of safe kerbside space. At moderate levels, parking stress can inconvenience local residents and make it difficult for service providers to park near their destinations. Higher levels of parking stress can lead to double parking and parking at junctions, which are road safety hazards and block the flow of traffic.

One of the two main purposes of a PZ is to effectively manage the supply and demand for on-street parking in an area, the other being the related goal of discouraging car use in favour of more sustainable forms of transport. In doing so, the Council helps to improve road safety, reduce congestion, improve the local environment, reduce carbon dioxide emissions and improve local air quality.

PZs help the Council to prioritise parking spaces according to need. The most common example is providing resident-only parking to protect local residents’ parking needs from the non-local parking demands of commuters; this helps residents to park conveniently and as close as possible to their homes.
A permit system is essential in a PZ so that the Council is able to prioritise parking for local users, and enforcement of the system would not be possible without the issuing of Penalty Charge Notices (PCNs) to motorists parked in contravention. The sale of permits and revenue from enforcement activities offset the costs of implementation, enforcement, maintenance of lines, signs and posts, and the back-office support the service needs to function. Any surplus is used strictly in accordance with legislation.

1.4 PZ Coverage

The Council has introduced a total of 19 PZs to date, some of which consist of only one street. Permit holder parking signs include the name of the zone, and only permits and vouchers issued for the same zone can park there.

In addition there are two Restricted Zones and seven “Pay & Display” individual streets.

PZs cover approximately 30% of the Borough, and are focused around main town centres and areas of extensive commercial use, areas close to commuter stations or public transport hubs and amenity areas such as parks and open spaces that attract large numbers of vehicles from outside the immediate area. Some parts of the Borough, mainly towards the North and the South, remain largely uncontrolled.

The PZ’s have been generally introduced street by street over time leaving large “gaps” where there is no enforcement zone, and also dividing some streets into two zones according to odd and even number houses, with two sets of signs.

A complete list of zones is included in Appendix A and a map showing the distribution of CPZs throughout the Borough in Appendix B.

The hours of operation can vary significantly between areas, which is summarised in Table 1. below:

**Current PZ Hours**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hours of Operation**</th>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>Times</th>
<th>Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Longest*</td>
<td>Anne Mews (AM)</td>
<td>At any time</td>
<td>24 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most common</td>
<td>B, F, J, ES, L, Heathway, Gascoigne Estate, Dagenham East CPZs</td>
<td>08.30 to 17.30 Mon to Sat</td>
<td>9 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shortest</td>
<td>Upney CPZ</td>
<td>1.30 – 2.30 pm</td>
<td>1 hour</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1

** correct as of Sept 2015
1.5 Identifying the Need for a PZ

Since 2010 the Council has had in place a robust, systematic framework for future PZ implementation in the Borough. As a result, parking controls have been put in place where there has been need and demand.

Parking zones help the Council fulfil its statutory duties in relation to parking management, congestion road safety and air quality. There are policy reasons to extend parking controls: for example, the Mayor of London’s Transport Strategy ¹ supports the expansion of PZs where boroughs consider it to be beneficial. However, the Council will not make changes without consulting the public.

Increased demand for parking comes from new residential and commercial developments, increased car ownership resulting from population growth in areas of the Borough such as the Re-generation zone and displaced parking from existing Hackney PZs. The expansion of PZs in neighbouring boroughs increases this pressure, as it can displace vehicles over the border. Improvements to the transport infrastructure will also increase these pressures: for example, the forthcoming Crossrail development in the North of the Borough and the Overground extension in the South.

The most common indicators of the need for a parking zone in an area are:

- **Parking stress**: supported by a ‘technical assessment’ of the available space and the demand for parking. The process of technical assessment involves measuring parking stress in the early morning and afternoon. Vehicles are classified as local or non-local according to when they are parked in the area, and the data is used to determine the source of stress. A region is generally said to be under parking stress if in the region of 80% or more of safe road space in an area is occupied.

- **Public support**: the level of public comment, complaints and petitions received by the Council. This is underlined by recent Network Management duty guidance ² where local communities are given the formal right to challenge parking policies.

1.6 Summary of the Consultation Process

**Informal Consultation**

1. Parking Services identify whether to consult or inform only based on the type of scheme. For example, if there is an at risk situation due to a road safety issue, we will not consult but we will write and inform residents who are affected by the scheme of our intentions. An example would be double yellow lining at junctions where impaired sightlines might be a determining factor.

2. Properties directly affected by the proposed scheme are identified

3. Residents are sent letters to consult or inform them of our intentions. If consulting, a URL link is provided to online consultation

4. The consultation period is usually up to 4 weeks duration.

5. The consultation is formally closed

6. Residents are informed of the outcome following a consultation

¹ Mayor of London’s Transport Strategy, Greater London Authority, 2010, s 5.26.5
7. Letters are sent to residents nearer the time civil works are due to commence reminding them we wrote to them at stage 6

**Formal consultation** (commences following stage 5 of informal consultation)

Scheme details are issued to the relevant section within Parking Services for implementation.

1.7 **PZ Reviews**

There are currently no set timescales in place for reviewing CPZs which have been implemented. It has been recognised that the process of reviewing PZs every five-seven years can be consuming and ultimately unnecessary, particularly in circumstances where residents remain satisfied with the parking controls in their area. Therefore, the Council should propose to review a PZ only when a need is identified, which will allow the Council to direct its resources more appropriately and tackle the issues within a PZ requiring the most attention. The Council will identify reviews through changes to the PZs surrounding environment including new developments, safety issues and will also consider requests from residents.

1.8 **Consultation on Housing Estates**

Properties on housing estates and private roads are not currently included in PZ consultations even though they may have separate parking controls - or no controls at all. The Council should consider including Estates in future PZ consultations in the context of the supply and demand for parking in and around the Estate.

Where possible, within the Informal and Formal process, Barking & Dagenham should conduct a separate, simultaneous consultation on housing estates covered by a proposed PZ. In addition, there are some residential estates with parking stress problems which should be identified. These problems include traffic flow issues caused by congestion and instances of problem parking (in some cases footway parking) adjacent to the estate.

1.9 **Permits**

Barking and Dagenham’s strategic approach to Parking Zones has been predominately based around a “Resident Only” approach, whereby the bulk of parking bays are available to resident permit holders only. This is not an uncommon approach across the London area, although not the only approach. Alternative approaches are explored in section 2.0.

The council has in place a complex system of permits, scratch cards and informal rules that allow parking in the CPZ network. A summary is shown in Table 2. Below:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Resident Visitor scratch cards</td>
<td>9,225</td>
<td>Daily + 4 Hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Resident Permits</td>
<td>7,357</td>
<td>12 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Staff Permits</td>
<td>663</td>
<td>12 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Operational Permits</td>
<td>642</td>
<td>12 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Essential Worker Permits</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>12 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Voluntary Permits</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>3 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Business Permits</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>12 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Members Permits</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>12 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Associate Permits</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>4,6,12 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Faith Minister</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Doctors Permits</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12 months</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2**

The advantage of such a complex network of permits and rules is that almost every parking eventuality is catered for. The disadvantage is that the comprehensive nature of the system in itself, defeats to some degree, the original intention of the CPZ, which was intended to restrict parking in the first instance, in addition to being burdensome to administer and maintain.

In contrast a neighbouring Borough Redbridge which has a similar population density and CPZ make up, operates a much simpler system outlined at Table 3:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Resident Permit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Visitor Permit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Business Permit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Essential User Permit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 3**

Further benchmarking detail can be found in [Appendix D](#).

An overview of permits 1 to 11 (table 1) and their application criteria is attached as [Appendix C](#).

### 2.0 Alternative Options to a CPZ

When discussing the alternative options for a CPZ it is important to consider what the root of the parking problem is and what the priority outcomes are of the scheme before designing it.

A CPZ is often introduced to prevent commuters parking in a particular area, and to provide controls for parking places within it, including permit parking. It is not, however, necessary to introduce a CPZ in order to provide permit parking.

Some other options that can control commuter/undesired parking are:

- Restricted Zones
- Permit Holder Parking Past This Point
- Individual Resident Parking Schemes
- No Waiting (staggered control)
- Limited Waiting Restrictions (and free shared use)
- Pay and Display (and charged shared use)

3.0 Public Interest

Members are asked to note that it is in the public interest that we consolidate areas; this will reduce displacement and improve transparency within the service.

A common theme in recent complaints has been a request for a CPZ extension from residents on the border with the CPZ or with a neighbouring Borough. Further details in Table 7 Below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>CPZ/Street</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aug-15</td>
<td>Ivyhouse Road</td>
<td>Resident/ Councillor</td>
<td>Requests CPZ extension (border area with CPZ full of congestion)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul-15</td>
<td>Longbridge Road</td>
<td>Resident/Councillor</td>
<td>High cost of permits for impending scheme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul-15</td>
<td>London Road, Rear of 9-29</td>
<td>Resident/MP</td>
<td>Requests CPZ extension due to parking stress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul-15</td>
<td>Park, Monteagle and Faircross Avenues.</td>
<td>Residents petition</td>
<td>Request to withdraw extension from 5.30pm to 9pm and Saturdays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul-15</td>
<td>Park, Monteagle and Faircross Avenues.</td>
<td>Resident/MP</td>
<td>Request to withdraw extension from 5.30pm to 9pm and Saturdays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May-15</td>
<td>Lambourne Road</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>Requests CPZ extension due to no space for residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr-15</td>
<td>Longbridge Road 614-175 &amp; OS 566</td>
<td>Residents of Academy Court</td>
<td>Request to review scheme and that Academy Court not consulted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar-15</td>
<td>Lambourne Road</td>
<td>Resident/MP</td>
<td>CPZ removed resulting in congestion (2 complaints)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov-14</td>
<td>Dagenham Road</td>
<td>Resident/Councillor</td>
<td>Request to implement scheme due to overspill from adjacent Havering</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.

3.1 Efficient service

For a Civil Enforcement Officer (CEO) to visit an area it is much more efficient and more effective way of working to be able to walk a whole area; currently what we have is odd streets with varying times of enforcement and therefore a high proportion of time on their beat is wasted going from one place to another.
3.2 What is consolidation

Barking and Dagenham is a borough with high pollution and areas suffering from excessive traffic congestion in some areas which are mainly around transport hubs, shopping areas and those convenient for commuter traffic.

Consolidation of areas ensures that individual roads are not subjected to displacement and that residents receive the right level of robust enforcement they are paying for via their permits.

To draw a line about a sensible sized area protects the interest of those who live within the area and offer protection for them to be able to park within a close proximity of their property. We have found that through varying times and dates of restrictions in certain areas those that finish earlier than others in the same location are subject to overflowing congestion.

3.3 Advantages of adopting a CPZ Consolidation strategy throughout the Borough.

- There would be a reduction in Implementation Costs
- Efficiencies in Enforcement: Consolidation will lead to more efficient ways of working for Civil Enforcement Officers and a more even and equitable deployment of enforcement officers
- Preparation for future developments. Consolidation will pre-empt future demand for parking which will come from the re-generation Zones and make it easier to plan new parking zones and the allocation of kerb space
- Reduction in street clutter. Consolidation will lead to a reduced requirement for the clustering of unsightly street signs
- Quicker response to resident concerns. The Council will take a more pro-active approach to listening to residents requirements
- Helps the introduction of a virtual permits system which will reduce costs further. Consolidation will lead to efficiencies in managing the permits database and in enforcement where automated methods could be used.

4.0 Recommended Next Steps

Start the consultation process with Resident Groups to understand what is is residents do / do not like about CPZ’s
Evaluate outcome and make recommendations
Put forward recommendations to Scrutiny

5.0 Scoping & Methodology

This section outlines the scope of the Review which includes the areas the SSCSC wished to explore and the different methods the SSCSC used to collate evidence for potential recommendations.

We have used the methodology from previous reviews and what has been found out through the complaints and service request service.
The scope of this report is to enable the service to be consistent in its approach to localised parking schemes and to ensure value to the user and the community and to enhance the usage of on and off street assets in a fair and transparent way.

In addition to analysis of complaints and enquiries; parking services have made several recommendations for consideration and support of the final parking strategy.

6.0 Timetable

- Benchmarking of other Local Authority Permits and rationalise the number of different permits on offer – November 2015
- Start of consultation process Borough Wide at Ward Member surgeries – January 2016
- Evaluate outcome of consultation and make recommendations – February 2016
- Recommendations back to SSCSC – April 2016